

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawing includes changes to Figures 2 and 3. A complete set of replacement drawings is enclosed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Counsel has received and reviewed the Office Action mailed September 23, 2005. In that Action the Examiner noted that an English version of a particular citation has not been provided. Counsel has requested for such to be provided, and counsel will forward it in a separate IDS as soon as it is received.

The Examiner noted that a word has been omitted from the Declaration filed in this application. Counsel has forwarded a new declaration to the Assignee, a foreign entity, and will submit that new declaration as soon as it is received.

The Examiner noted smudging in some of the drawings, and with this response replacement drawings are provided.

The Examiner also noted that subpart A and B of Figure 2 require separate labeling. The copies of the drawings submitted herewith have labeled those portions of the drawings of Figure 2 as Fig. 2A and Fig. 2B. Counsel believes this should overcome the Examiner's objection, and notes that the same approach is taken with respect to Figure 3.

The Examiner objected to the specification and requested a new title. By this response a new title is provided.

The Examiner rejected the application on the basis of a double-patenting rejection in view of the parent application, now U.S. Patent 6,592,032. A terminal disclaimer is provided with this response.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated, but indicated that claims 25 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response counsel has canceled all claims and submits herewith new claims 28-37. New claim 28 consists of the combination of former claim 25 together with the base claim and any intervening claims. The form of the claim is slightly changed from a mere combination of those claims to place it in better form. However, all limitations from the previous claims are incorporated within new claim 28. Claims 29 and 30 depend from new claim 28 and should be allowable for at least that reason. New claims 31-34 are presented for examination with this response. Claim 31 is written in a manner to parallel claim 28 and is believed to include all of the limitations of claim 28, together with an additional limitation specifying further conditions of operation should the attribute information be stored in the temporary data base.

For these reasons claim 31 is also believed to distinguish the cited references. Claim 35 is a further independent claim, but one which is written from the perspective of claim 28 with similar limitations. It is believed to distinguish the cited references for the same reasons. Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 35, and are believed allowable for at least that reason.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6303 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Colwell  
Reg. No. 27,431

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
RCC: mks  
60709852 v1